



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

brings suggestions for future work, often from the most unexpected quarters. It is a constant source of inspiration to the members to note how governmental personalities vie with the man in the street in offering constructive suggestions.

THE ROAD TO A MORE LASTING PEACE

By EDWARD A. FILENE

(The Editors of the Advocate of Peace are glad to give space to independent personal expressions of opinion such as the following, even when these do not express the views of the American Peace Society. It is hoped that in the discussion aroused by such definitely expressed views truth may be advanced.)

THE editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE has asked me to state my conviction of the duty that the present international crisis imposes upon the United States as the largest of the nations not actually involved in the war. I am glad to do this, for my conviction is clear.

Sane thinking on the period of reconstruction that will follow the war is fundamental to our thinking on all political, industrial, and social problems, because all of the important things of the future are going to be influenced by this war. Had humanitarian and ethical impulse been totally absent, still my own business interests would have driven me to a serious consideration of the probable situation at the end of the war and the policies that should then dominate in order to give the nations of the world some measure of relief from the fear of another war and, therefore, a chance to turn their energies to the normal problems of civil and industrial life. All of the problems of future business prosperity, of social welfare, and of the advance of democracy will hang in the balance until some practical method is found for making wars less probable and peace more permanent.

With a reasonably fire-proof building and an efficient fire company in my city, I should as soon think of going without fire insurance for the next few years as to fail to do all in my power to aid in finding some solution to the problem of more stable international relations.

If the present war is settled as all other wars have been settled, leaving no method but war for the settling of the inevitable disputes that will arise between nations, then the nations of Europe will be compelled to add to their enormous war debts and the expense of the normal rebuilding of their industries the continuous and increasing expense of an intense rivalry in armaments, as a preparation for the next conflict. If such a situation obtains, the United States will be forced, whether she wills it or not, into an abnormal increase in armaments and an increased militarization of her national ideals.

My contention, stated briefly and without detailed argument, is this:

The present international situation imposes upon the United States the following duty, which, if assumed, will not only guarantee our self-preservation, but will make it possible for us to make a contribution to a very fundamental advance in civilization. This duty may be stated from two angles. It is the clear duty of the United States to put her army and navy in a state of

adequate preparedness. The outstanding lesson of this war is that so long as autocratic governments back their claims by force, the more democratic governments dare not trust for protection merely to their superior ideals. If democratic ideals are superior, we are not justified in taking any risk about their safety. Force without ideals is dangerous, but ideals without force are too often powerless. We have not yet reached a point where an ideal will stop a bullet. We cannot afford to live in a fool's paradise, and think that because we are a democracy we are safe. The more valuable our ideal, the more important it is to protect it adequately.

The question involved in preparedness is not whether it is right or wrong to use force. The question is, Shall force be used to destroy democratic civilization or to support it?

But this war has also proved that when nations pile up armies for the sole purpose of defense, sooner or later a conflict of national interests arises, and with a ready weapon at hand it is easy to yield to the temptation of war. There is little doubt that if we had had a good fighting machine at the time of the sinking of the *Lusitania* an aroused public opinion would probably have insisted that we use our power in defense of our rights. There is no doubt but that if preparedness is not based upon a far-seeing policy, in every provocation a nation is tempted to try out its power.

For this reason, I am convinced that a program of preparedness will not succeed, and probably should not succeed, unless it is based upon a proposal that our military force shall be used not only as our arm of defense, but also as our contribution toward helping to keep the peace of the world. In other words, I think that the success of any program of preparedness, as well as our duty to civilization, demands that the United States should take the lead in advocating an international program under which the nations of the world should abandon the system of rival group alliances and should create instead an alliance of all of the civilized powers pledged to use their combined power as a collective guarantee of each against aggression.

At the close of the war the public opinion of America should be educated and unified to a point where it will support the Government of the United States in advocating the establishment of an International Court and Council of Conciliation, supported by a League of Nations, agreeing to use their combined power to enforce every nation to submit its disputes thereto for examination before proceeding to make war, this combined power to be used first in the form of a system of financial and commercial non-intercourse which would bring about automatically the complete isolation from the benefits of international civilization any nation that refused to submit its disputes for examination before going to war, and that in the event such economic pressure proved ineffective, the nations of the league should use their combined military power to enforce submission to the court or council.

Not only should the expressed support of the United States to this proposal be in existence at the end of the war, but we should strive to have the nations of Latin America behind the proposal.

If, at the end of the war, the United States and the States of Latin America stand ready with such a proposal, I am convinced that there is a reasonable chance

that such a League of Nations will be formed. Let me briefly state my reasons for this belief:

(1) It will be to the material advantage of every nation in Europe to enter such a league. It would afford to every nation in Europe a more reliable pledge of protection than any group alliance can give. Throughout history, group alliances have had a constantly shifting membership. History affords many such examples as that of the Balkan allies splitting up over the terms of settlement at the end of the Balkan war and finally losing more than they had gained. The inevitable conflict of national interests is a constant threat against the permanency of any group alliance.

One of our distinguished publicists has stated the superiority of such a league over any group alliance as follows: When Germany, asked by the allies at the conference on terms of settlement to remove the menace of her militarism, replies, "What of my protection against Russia?" all of the nations of the league could reply, "We will all protect you against Russia, just as we would all protect Russia against you."

Again, if the nations of Europe are compelled to enter another costly rivalry in armaments, the resulting taxation, added, as I have said, to the enormous war debts and the expense of industrial reconstruction, will place such a burden upon the nations that sooner or later revolutionary protests will arise from the masses demanding that the governments find some way of relief from the abnormal burdens of militarism.

(2) It will be to the material interest of America to enter such a league, because if Europe is left in the grip of a rivalry in armaments, her need for money will be greater than ever, and in her efforts to get the necessary money, not only to pay her war debts and rebuild her industries, but to play her part in the race for armaments, she will institute a competition for world markets more intense and destructive than ever in the business history of the world. In this destructive competition, there is not a single problem of American democracy that will not be complicated. The solution of our labor problem, our tariff problem, our taxation problem, our foreign-trade problem, and our immigration problem will be made increasingly difficult.

This war has proved that the Americas are the largest and safest source of those supplies upon which modern warfare depends. Therefore, if before the world the United States and the States of Latin America stand committed to the program of a League of Nations to Enforce Peace by the uses of economic pressure and military power if necessary, there is no question but that the voice of the Americas will influence profoundly the terms of settlement of the war.

The essential ideas of the program that I have outlined are included in the program of the League to Enforce Peace and form the basis of a referendum upon which the business men in the constituent bodies of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recently voted.

I conceive it to be the duty of every man who has the future welfare of America at heart to support this program, to make definite efforts from day to day to influence individuals, organizations, newspapers, and government officials, in so far as he has connections therewith, towards support of this program. It is the one practical program now before the world that prom-

ises actually to secure that more permanent peace which has been the dream and desire of all sincere men through the centuries.

WAR, RIGHT OR WRONG

By MEI TI (China, about 2500 B. C.)

Translated by E. H. Hou

In the fifth and sixth centuries B. C. there were many philosophers and schools in China. Mei Ti was one of the greatest of them. At that time even Confucius could not overshadow him. His well-known "Love All" doctrine was later severely attacked by Mencius, the great follower of Confucius. Not only his philosophy, but also his literary ability, have been greatly admired by his own people. The following is a translation of one of his short essays. By his use of the title "gentlemen under the heaven," he means the philosophers of his time.—*Translator.*

HERE is a man going into the garden or orchard of some one else. He steals the peaches and prunes from it. All those who hear of this will condemn him, and the authorities will arrest and fine him. Why? Because he does harm to others and benefits himself thereby.

Here is another man stealing other people's dogs, chickens, and hogs. He is worse than the first man. Why? Because the more harm to others he does, the more wicked he is and the greater the crime is.

Here is a third who enters through his neighbor's fences and stables, stealing the cattle and horses. He is considered worse and more heartless than the second man. Why? Because he has done more harm to his neighbor, so his crime is still greater.

Furthermore, the man who murders the innocent neighbor and gets his victim's fur coat and sword, is worse than the third. Why? Because he has done greater harm, and so he is a more wicked man.

At this time, all the gentlemen under the heaven know that he is doing wrong, and they all condemn him.

Now, then, the greatest of these gentlemen is to attack a neighboring country. Not only does nobody see that this should be condemned, but, on the contrary, every one praises it, sanctions it, and calls it right. Does the world know the difference between *right* and *wrong*?

It is considered wrong to murder one man, and there is capital punishment for this crime. Then the crime of killing ten men is ten times as bad as that of killing one, and the punishment should be also ten times as much. The crime of murdering one hundred persons is one hundred times as bad, and the punishment should be also one hundred times as much. At this time, in this case, every gentleman under the heaven knows how to condemn it, and calls it *wrong* or crime.

But the greatest crime is to invade another country, killing many men. Nobody condemns it, but praises it. Because no one knows it is wrong to go to attack another nation, they write about their glorious victory in order to let the future generations read it. If they could discover the wickedness of war, what is the pleasure of writing such a record of it?

It is just like a man who calls a little black black, and calls much black white. He cannot tell black from white. It is bitter when little is tasted. He calls